

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, and 29-34 are presently active in this case. Claims 2-4 and 11-28 were cancelled by previous amendments. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 5-6, and 8, and adds new Claims 29-34 without introducing any new matter; and cancels Claim 7 without prejudice or disclaimer.

The November 13, 2009 Office Action rejected Claims 1 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,259, hereinafter “Zhang”) in view of Nakabayashi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112810, hereinafter “Nakabayashi”).

In response, Applicants’ independent Claim 1 is amended to recite that the “route control table [is] describing each of the other wireless base stations in the network in association with a next hop . . . the next hop being determined in accordance with a wireless base station to which a source terminal device or a destination terminal device currently belongs,” and to recite that “the wireless base stations is configured to . . . identify a wireless base station . . . to find the next hop according to the route control table.” These features find non-limiting support in Applicants’ disclosure as originally filed, for example in the published application with the Serial No. 2007/0280192 at paragraph [0104]. Similar features were previously presented in dependent Claim 7, and consequently, this claim is herewith cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Independent Claim 6 is amended to recite an analogous feature, and dependent Claims 5 and 8 are amended to reflect the changes made to the respective independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Moreover, new Claims 29-34 have been added. New independent Claims 29 and 32 are different in scope than independent Claims 1 and 6. These new claims find non-limiting

support in Applicants' disclosure as originally filed, for example in the published application at paragraphs [0104]-[0109]. No new matter has been added.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection, as discussed next.

The applied reference Zhang is directed to a location update protocol that can be used in mobile communications networks for managing subscriber profile information, that is associated with the subscribers of a network. (Zhang, Abstract.) In Zhang, when a base station 114 receives a registration message from a mobile host 120, and an authentication procedure has been satisfied, the base station updates the local profile subscriber list 150, by adding the profile associated with the new host to the local subscriber list. (Zhang, col. 31, ll. 26-30, Figs. 3-4, and 10A.) However, Applicants' independent Claim 1 requires that the wireless base stations identifies a wireless base station to which the terminal device currently belongs, based on a source address of the source terminal device or a destination address of the destination terminal device, respectively, included in the received packet, *to find the next hop according to the route control table*. In contrast, Zhang merely updates the local profile subscriber list for the respective base station. Therefore, Zhang fails to teach all the features of Applicants' independent Claim 1.

The cited passages of Nakabayashi, used by the pending Office Action to form the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, fails to remedy the deficiencies of Zhang, even if we assume that the combination is proper, as next discussed.

Nakabayashi is directed to a method of selecting wireless bridges from other wireless bridges, each of these bridges having a communication quality at a predetermined level or higher, which are located in a range where the wireless bridge can communicate, using a spanning tree protocol (STP). (Nakabayashi, Abstract.) In Nakabayashi, a connection table is

used based on the reception level or a bridge priority value. (Nakabayashi, ¶¶ [0016]-[0017], [0059] and [0073], see also Fig. 1.) A wireless bridge with the lowest bridge priority value in the network is the root bridge. (Nakabayashi, ¶ [0044], ¶ [0059]). Also, Nakabayashi's routing table 20 contains the port number 21, the bridge ID 22, and the destination addresses 23, and the destination address field 23 contains broadcasting/multicasting addresses. (Nakabayashi, ¶ [0051]). However, Nakabayashi fails to teach that the next hop is determined in accordance with a wireless base station to which a source terminal device or a destination terminal device currently belongs, and that the next hop is found according to the route control table, as required by Applicants' independent Claim 1. To the contrary, Nakabayashi never selects a next hop based on a route control table, but based on a reception level or priority value.

Therefore, even if the combination of Zhang and Nakabayashi is assumed to be proper, the cited passages of the combination fails to teach every element of Applicants' Claim 1. Moreover, independent Claim 6 recites features that are analogous to the features of independent Claim 1 as argued above, but is different in scope. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration of this rejection based on these references.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, and 29-34 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Nikolaus P. Schibli, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 56,994

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/09)  
3388186\_1.DOC